

## HOW WE SHOULD TRY TO CONVINCE

## EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Nearly all real estate agents talk too much. They do not know when to stop. They create in the mind of their customer the desire to buy; then, instead of stopping and closing the contract, they keep on talking, raise some point of doubt or uncertainty, and spoil the sale.

If they would state the essential features and then let the purchaser do the talking, answering only the points he raises, they would meet with much greater success.

The Single Tax, like the well-planned, up-to-date, well-built house, possesses so many points of merit that we Single Taxers likewise talk too much. We overdo the job. We convince our listener, then continue until we have raised some point beyond his imagination or comprehension—the average man has little of either—and leave him a “doubting Thomas.” This in my opinion is why the Single Tax has not been more generally adopted.

In presenting the subject why not simply say that “the rent belongs to the people,” and show why; then state that all forms of taxation should be abolished and show why; then simply answer any objections which may occur to the listener? I have tried this plan and it works.

Single Tax, site value, land value, the incidence of taxation, the taxation of rents—all are beside the point. What we propose is to take the rent and abolish taxation. Then why not say so?

After the rent is taken there will be no taxes to discuss. The law of rent is a beneficent natural law—evidently intended to bear public burdens. Rent will continue under any and all forms of taxation, and with taxation eliminated.

If Henry George, Shearman and Fillebrown had treated the subject as above indicated, their books would have been smaller and simpler. In fact, “Progress and Poverty” would have been somewhat abridged; “Natural Taxation” and “The A B C of Taxation” would have been small pamphlets. E. R. A. Seligman’s “Inci-

dence of Taxation” with its 427 pages and two and a quarter pounds of weight, need not have been published at all.

Read “Progress and Poverty” with my formula in mind and see how it works. Primarily the Single Tax is a moral issue. It is either right or not right to take the rent for public use. If right, the squarer that issue is brought before the people the quicker will they see its justice and adopt it.

As has often been said, the name “Single Tax” has done much to retard the growth of the movement. Suppose instead we had been dubbed Land Renters or Anti-taxers. Wouldn’t it have been different? I think it would.—A. A. WHIPPLE, Kansas City, Mo.

## THE FORM OF THE QUESTION, ARE YOU A SINGLE TAXER?

## EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

An inquiry is now being addressed by the Fels Fund Commission to persons of prominence in the United States asking whether they avow themselves Single Taxers. Many who will answer this question in the negative are believers in the fundamental philosophy of Henry George, that land values are created by the community and should be taken for public use, either entirely or to such extent as the needs of government and society require. Such persons may believe that the revenue so derived will not be adequate for social needs or they may believe that regulative or repressive taxes should be imposed for their social effects. One writer who practically concedes the whole Single Tax position says that he cannot call himself a Single Taxer because he believes that inheritance taxes are just and necessary and will continue to be so for a long time. Another is not prepared to abandon taxes on saloons, dogs, automobiles and other things which he does not approve.

Of course the strict Single Taxer believes that their position is unsound, but is their deviation from the straight and narrow path of sufficient importance to justify their exclusion from the list of those who subscribe to our doctrines?